

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-35, and 71-77 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 4-36, and 39-70 presently stand rejected. Claim 1 is amended, claims 36-70 are canceled and new claims 71-77 are added herein. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-17, 28-32, 36, 39-52, and 63-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Acharya (US 2002/0101524 A1) and Yeo et al. (US 6,738,509 B2). Claims 18-27, 33-35, 53-62, and 68-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Acharya (US 2002/0101524 A1) and Yeo et al. (US 6,738,509 B2) and further in view of Rashkovskiy et al. (US 6,252,577 B1).

It is noted that M.P.E.P. §2143(A)(1) requires a factual finding “...*that the prior art included **each** element claimed...*” Applicants respectfully submit that Acharya and Yeo, whether taken individually or in combination fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each element of claim 1.

Claim 1 presently recites:

A method for processing images, the method comprising:

act A: converting a single first image data from a first color space into a second image data that corresponds to a second color space, wherein the single first image data includes a first pixel and a second pixel, wherein the first pixel corresponds only to a first color component and the second pixel corresponds only to a second color component that is different from the first color component;

act B: perform image processing on the second image data in the second color space to form a processed image data; and

act C: converting the processed image data to a third image data that corresponds to the first color space, wherein **the third image data includes a third pixel and a fourth pixel, wherein the third pixel corresponds only to the first color component and the fourth pixel corresponds only to the second color component.**

[Emphasis added.] Thus, independent claim 1 expressly recites a first image data having first pixel that only corresponds to a first color component and a second pixel that only corresponds to a second color component. Independent claim 3 further recites performing image processing on the image data and then converting it to a third image data, where the **third image data** includes a **third pixel that corresponds only to the first color component** and a **fourth pixel that corresponds only to the second color component**.

The April 1, 2008 office action cites to the Bayer pattern of FIG. 1A of Acharya as allegedly showing Applicant's claimed **first** image data. However, Acharya fails to disclose, teach or suggest performing image processing on the image data and then converting the image data back to the Bayer pattern of FIG. 1A. Not only does Acharya fail to disclose converting the image data back to the Bayer pattern of FIG. 1A, but Acharya fails to disclose converting to a third image data, as presently claimed by Applicants.

The April 1, 2008 office action continues by citing to Yeo as allegedly disclosing converting the processed image data to the “...*first color space in figure 3, numeral 304 (claim act c)*...” (see Office Action, page 4). However, Yeo discloses that the output of transformer 304 is a **multi-spectral image**. (see Yeo, col. 6, lines 38-42). Yeo explicitly defines multi-spectral images as digital images where each pixel is defined by **multiple** components.

Attention is kindly directed to column 1, lines 20-27, which states:

A **multi-spectral image** is a collection of **two or more** monochrome images of the same scene. Multi-spectral images can be described in any one of a plurality of known spectral or color spaces. For example, one well-known multi-spectral image is an RGB color image. An RGB color image **consists of a red, a green, and a blue component** and, thus, the image is said to be described in RGB spectral space.

Thus, Yeo recites that a “multi-spectral image” is one that includes **multiple** monochrome images of the same scene. That is, each pixel includes multiple components representing the same image. Furthermore, in the same paragraph, Yeo recites an example of a multi-spectral image (i.e., an RGB color image) as consisting of

three components (i.e., red, green, and blue). Nowhere, in the cited portion, or elsewhere in Yeo, does this reference disclose a third image data as including a **third pixel that corresponds only to the first color component** and a **fourth pixel that corresponds only to the second color component**, as claimed by Applicants.

Therefore, since Yeo recites that the output of transformer 304 is a multi-spectral image, the reference necessarily fails to disclose a third image data that includes a third pixel and a fourth pixel, wherein the third pixel corresponds only to the first color component and the fourth pixel corresponds only to the second color component, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, neither reference, whether taken individually or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest converting to a third image data as presently recited in claim 1.

Rashkovskiy does not cure the deficiencies of Acharya and Yeo. Thus, the cited references fail to disclose each element of claim 1, as required under M.P.E.P. §2143. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 4-35 are nonobvious over the cited references for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with independent claim 1, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant §103 rejections of the dependent claims also be withdrawn.

New Claims 71-77

By way of this amendment, Applicants have added new dependent claims 71-77. Dependent claims 71-77 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with independent claim 1, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. For example, dependent claim 71 presently recites:

The method of Claim 1, wherein act A, act B, and act C are all performed by a **digital signal processor (DSP)** of an imaging capture system, wherein the imaging capture system includes an imaging capture device coupled to output the first image data to the DSP.

Thus, claim 71 further recites that acts A, B, and C are all performed by a digital signal processor included in an imaging capture system. The references, whether taken

individually or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest this expressly recited element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims, including newly added dependent claims 71-77 are allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 19, 2008

/Andrew J. Cameron Reg. #50281/

Andrew J. Cameron

Reg. No. 50,281

Phone: (206) 292-8600